REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-19 and 21-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and

21 are herein amended. No new matter has been presented.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the written description requirement.

Claim 21 has been amended to change "smothered" to --smoothed--. Claim 21 has also

been amended to change "polyoxyalklene alkylether" to --polyoxyethylene monoalkylether--.

Support for the limitation "wherein the structure of the polyoxyethylene monoalkylether

surfactant is a linear chain structure" is in the specification at page 28, lines 17-19 which

describes "polyoxyethylene monoalkylether surfactant (TN-80, a non-ionic surfactant

manufactured by Asahi Denka Co., Ltd.)" and as supported in the DEKA catalog attached to the

Amendment of September 10, 2009 (with a summary of the DEKA catalog at page 10 of the

Amendment).

Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-11, 14, 15, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kanda (EP 1152036) in view of Wesp (US 3,765,972); claim 7 was rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanda in view of Wesp, and further in

view of Suzuki (US 6,043,145); and claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

-9-

being unpatentable over Kanda in view of Wesp, and further in view of Takahashi (US

6,537,719) and Tanaka (US 6,555,617).

Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kanda in view of Wesp does not teach or suggest

"wherein the resist pattern smoothing material comprises at least one of cationic surfactants and

amphoteric surfactants" as recited in amended claim 1; and "wherein the resist pattern smoothing

material comprises polyoxyethylene monoalkylether surfactant, wherein the structure of the

polyoxyethylene monoalkylether surfactant is a linear chain structure" as recited in amended

claim 21.

The Office Action acknowledged that Kanda does not disclose a resist pattern smoothing

material comprising a surfactant as recited in claim 1. (Office Action, page 4.) The Office

Action cited Wesp for teaching the use of anionic surfactant. However, Wesp does not teach or

suggest the use of a cationic or amphoteric surfactant.

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-19 and 21-25 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created

doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of

copending Application No. 10/290,493.

Applicants will address the provisional rejection once all other rejections have been

withdrawn.

- 10 -

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.114

Attorney Docket No. 031029

Application No. 10/647,247

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-19 and 21-25 are patentable over

the cited references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 5-11, 14-19 and

21-25 is hereby solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants

submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request

such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to

expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate

extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect

to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/Andrew G. Melick/

Andrew G. Melick

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 56,868

Telephone: (202) 822-1100

Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

AGM/adp

- 11 -